

BEFORE THE
Federal Communications Commission
WASHINGTON, DC 20554

RECEIVED
JAN 30 1995

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

In the Matter of)

Revision of Part 22 of the Commission's Rules)
Governing the Public Mobile Services)

CC Docket No. 94-46

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Amendment of Part 22 of the Commission's)
Rules to Delete Section 22.119 and Permit the)
Concurrent Use of Transmitters in Common)
Carrier and Non-Common Carrier Service)

CC Docket No. 94-46
RM 8367

Amendment of Part 22 of the Commission's)
Rules Pertaining to Power Limits for Paging)
Stations Operating in the 931 MHz Band in the)
Public Land Mobile Service)

CC Docket No. 93-116

**JOINT REPLY COMMENTS OF
AIRTOUCH COMMUNICATIONS, INC. AND
U S WEST NEWVECTOR GROUP, INC.**

AirTouch Communications, Inc. and U S WEST NewVector Group, Inc.

("AirTouch/NewVector"), by their attorneys, hereby file reply comments to address two issues raised in this proceeding.

The first issue concerns the filing requirements associated with developmental authorizations. In their Joint Petition for Reconsideration and Clarification ("Joint Petition"), AirTouch/NewVector requested clarification that only those developmental authorization applications filed pursuant to new rule Section 22.409 (dealing with developmental authorizations "for a new Public Mobile Service or technology") would be considered major.¹

¹ See AirTouch/NewVector Joint Petition for Reconsideration and Clarification at 14-16.

AirTouch/NewVector urge the Commission to adopt this interpretation, which was supported by GTE.²

As a related matter, new rule Section 22.409(h), which sets forth the requirements applicable to developmental authorization renewal requests filed pursuant to Section 22.409, does not specify which FCC form should be utilized when renewals are sought. Under the old rules, parties filed an FCC Form 489 for this purpose. We were recently informed, however, that the Commission's staff wants developmental renewal applicants to use FCC Form 405 instead. AirTouch/NewVector seek clarification regarding the appropriate form to be used in these circumstances.

The second issue involves the filing requirements applicable to "external" cell sites as set forth in new rule Sections 22.163(e) and 22.165(e). These rules require licensees to notify the Commission of modifications and additional transmitters that change their CGSA. In their Joint Petition, AirTouch/NewVector asked the Commission to clarify that such notifications are not required for "external" cell sites that are internal to a consolidated CGSA.³ This same interpretation was endorsed by Cellular Communications of Puerto Rico, Inc. ("CCPR")⁴ and GTE.⁵

² See GTE's Comments and Opposition (filed January 20, 1995), at 5-6.

³ See Joint Petition at 12.

⁴ See CCPR Petition for Reconsideration (filed December 20, 1994), at 2 ("the Commission should extend its relaxation of notification requirements to include internal RSA and MSA borders of systems that are commonly owned or controlled and operated as integrated regional systems").

⁵ See GTE's Comments and Opposition at 6-8.

A related question has arisen regarding the applicability of new rule Sections 22.163(e) and 22.165(e) to existing external sites. It has come to our attention that these rules are being construed inconsistently at the Commission. Under one interpretation, Form 489s need only be filed in those circumstances where the CGSA boundary is changed. The other interpretation is that a Form 489 would be required when technical changes are made to existing external cell sites.⁶ To avoid further confusion, AirTouch/NewVector request that the Commission clarify which of the two interpretations is correct.

Respectfully submitted,

AIRTOUCH COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
U S WEST NEWVECTOR GROUP, INC.

Kathryn A. Zachem
Kenneth D. Patrich
WILKINSON, BARKER, KNAUER & QUINN
1735 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 783-4141

David A. Gross
Kathleen Q. Abernathy
AIRTOUCH COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
1818 N Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 293-3800

Donald M. Mukai
U S WEST NEWVECTOR GROUP, INC.
3350 161st Avenue, S.E.
Bellevue, WA 98008
(206) 562-5614

Their Attorneys

Dated: January 30, 1995

⁶ A filing would be required any time there is a change to the technical information previously provided to the Commission with respect to any existing external cell site.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Donna L. McClain, hereby certify that I have this 30th day of January, 1995, caused copies of the foregoing Joint Reply Comments of AirTouch Communications, Inc. and U S WEST NewVector Group, Inc. to be delivered by first class U.S. mail, postage prepaid, to the following:

Andre J. Lachance
1850 M Street, N.W., Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20036
Counsel for GTE Service Corporation

Cathleen A. Massey
Roseanna DeMaria
McCaw Cellular Communications, Inc.
1150 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., 4th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20036

Mark Stachiw
AirTouch Paging
Three Forest Plaza
12221 Merit Drive, Suite 800
Dallas, Texas 75251

Carl W. Northrop
Bryan Cave
700 13th Street, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Counsel for Arch Communications Group

Jay C. Keithley
1850 K Street, N.W., Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20036
Counsel for Sprint Corporation

Craig T. Smith
P.O. Box 11315
Kansas City, MO 64112
Counsel for Sprint Corporation

Andrea D. Williams
Michael F. Altschul
Randall S. Coleman
Cellular Telecommunications Industry
Association
1250 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Ste. 200
Washington, D.C. 20036

George Petrutsas
Fletcher, Heald & Hildreth, P.L.C.
1300 N. 17th Street, 11th Floor
Rosslyn, VA 22209
Counsel for Matsushita Communications
Industrial Corporation of America

David H. Pawlik
Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom
1440 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
Counsel for Cellular Communications of
Puerto Rico, Inc.



Donna L. McClain